

MAY 29 1966

Approved For Release 2004/12/17 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000700140013-9
Rees Kenworthy, E. W.
By Richard B.



The New York Times (by George Tames)

KEEP OUT!: Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, chairman of the C.I.A. watchdog subcommittee, opposes a move to expand the mem-

bership of the group. He contends the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, which voted for the change, is trying to "muscle in."

How Many Watchdogs for C.I.A.?

By E. W. KENWORTHY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 21—Once again, after a lapse of 10 years, the United States Senate is going to have a chance to do something, if it so desires, about the vexed question of "legislative oversight" of the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Two weeks ago, the Foreign Relations Committee approved, 14 to 5, a resolution to set up a nine-man Select Committee on Intelligence Operations, with the Armed Services, Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees each furnishing three members. The resolution is now scheduled to reach the Senate floor next Wednesday.

Ever since the C.I.A. was established by the National Security Act of 1947, the director of the agency has reported in tightest secrecy to subcommittees of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of both houses. The House subcommittees meet separately; those in the Senate, because of duplicating membership, for convenience sake meet together.

C.I.A. Influence

The proposal for the enlarged watchdog committee was sponsored by Eugene J. McCarthy, Democrat of

had the full support of J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, the committee chairman.

Supporters of an expanded committee base their case on the assertion that the C.I.A., if it does not make foreign policy, certainly influences it, and therefore the Foreign Relations Committee should have a role in the legislative oversight.

Other reasons that, because of senatorial courtesy, cannot be publicly avowed, are that the present watchdog subcommittee of seven members is neither very aggressive nor inquisitive, that it is satisfied to be told no more than the director of the agency volunteers; that it is inclined to be content with military justifications for an operation without considering its possibly unfortunate political consequences; and that the information it receives about an operation is supplied after the event, too late for the exercise of Congressional caution or advice.

In an obvious effort to influence the committee vote on the day before it was taken, Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, chairman of both the Armed Services Committee and the C.I.A. watchdog subcommittee, bitterly assailed the McCarthy resolution on two grounds.

First, he said, the Foreign Relations Committee is trying to "muscle in" on the jurisdiction of

the Armed Services Committee. Second, he asserted, enlargement of the C.I.A. subcommittee would put its necessary secrecy in jeopardy and probably endanger the lives of C.I.A. agents and their informants. He is proud to say, Mr. Russell went on, that there has never been a "harmful leak" from the subcommittee.

But he had read articles based on leaks from the Foreign Relations Committee, and a "segment of the press" was now exerting pressure to expand the C.I.A. subcommittee in the hope of getting information now denied it.

The first reason was widely regarded as the "real" reason for Mr. Russell's alarm, and the second as merely a "good" reason. In fact, the Senator's appeal to security aroused some smiles in the press gallery and some ire among some of his colleagues.

On the one hand, Mr. Russell seemed to be suggesting, since representatives from the Foreign Relations Committee would be chosen, according to custom, from the four ranking members, that Democratic Senators Fulbright and John Sparkman of Alabama, and Republican Senators Bourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa, and George D. Alken of Vermont, could not be trusted with secret information. Some Senators felt this

Continued